

Negation in Vietnamese and in some of the Việt-Mường languages

Nguyễn Phú Phong
EHESS-CNRS/CRLAO and Université Paris 7, France

In modern Vietnamese, the negative morpheme is *không*. In the 17th century however, the negative particle was *chẳng* as attested in A. de Rhodes' *Brevis Declaratio* included in his *Dictionarium annamiticum lusitanum, et latinum*.

Không is borrowed from Chinese : transcribed by the character 空, it is categorized in this language as an adjective meaning 'empty, void'. Due to an internal evolution, *không* has become a regular negative particle in Vietnamese, and replaces *chẳng* of Vietnamese origin. The grammaticalization of *không* which extended over many centuries did not fail to rouse the curiosity of linguists, more especially as this phenomenon was taking place outside of any Chinese domination.

Why this replacement of *chẳng* by *không* ? Did *không* bring something more with regard to negation ? To answer this question, we will relate the opposition of *chẳng/không* to that of two types of negation, negation of truth and negation of existence.

1. The *chẳng/không* contrast

Nowadays, *không* has completely replaced *chẳng* as a negative preverb. Hà Q.N. et Pham N.T. (1976) counted 732 uses of *không* for 129 uses of *chẳng* in a survey of the press vocabulary. Many syntax-semantic differences between *chẳng* and *không* explain the replacement of the first by the second.

1.1. Yes-no questions using sentences with nominal predicate

Chẳng or rather its allomorph *chăng*, contrary to *không*, can serve as a negative particle in a yes-no question whose affirmative term is a sentence with nominal predicate. Below is a declarative sentence, ex. (1), and its interrogative counterpart, ex. (2):

- (1) Nó là sinh viên
he be student
He is a student
- (2) Nó là sinh viên (hay) chẳng ?
he be student or Neg.
Is he a student ?

If we replace *chẳng* by *không*, then the resulting sentence (3) will be ill-formed :

- (3) **Nó là sinh viên (hay) không ?*

The contrast acceptable/unacceptable between (2) and (3) can be explained by the fact that *không* serves to negate an existence while *chẳng/chẳng* is used to deny a truth. This will be clear in (4) where if we do not replace *không* by *chẳng*, we have to add before the copula *là* 'to be' the morphemes *(có) phải* '(to exist) true' :

- (4) *Nó (có) phải là sinh viên (hay) không ?*
 he (exist) true be student or Neg.
 Is he a student ?

Why in (4), is the particle *không* acceptable when it is not in (3) ? Because in (4), the reading of *không* is the same as *chẳng*. Indeed, by referring to the affirmative term of the yes-no question, *không* has to be read as *không (có) phải* and not just as *không* in (3). But *không (có) phải* [literally: Neg. (to exist) true] turns out to be a negation that brings upon *(có) phải* '(to exist) true', the truth; *có* is optional because for all negation marked by *không* if not otherwise specified, it should be understood as a negation bringing upon *có* 'to exist' recoverable, that is a negation of existence. This allows us to say that *không* is equivalent to *không có*. This equivalence can be clearly shown by means of a yes-no question whose affirmative term is a sentence with verbal predicate:

- (5) *Nó (có) chạy không ?*
 he (có) run Neg.
 Does he run ?

Có is not obligatory in (5) but to answer "yes" to this question, we have to say *có* ; and this fact means that *có* is always there and recoverable. Furthermore, the negative answer to (5) is either *không* or *không có*. The contrast *yes/no* for (5) turns out to be *có/không* with *không* interpreted as *không có*. In sum, two types of predicate-phrase should be distinguished, verbal predicate and nominal predicate; verbal predicate is negated by *không (có)* while nominal predicate, marked by the copula *là*, is negated by *không (có) phải*. With regard to the synonymy between (2) and (4), it may be said that *chẳng* is semantically equivalent to *không (có) phải*.

Taking into account the respective semantics of *có* 'to exist' and *phải* 'true', the distinction *negation of existence/negation of truth* corresponding to the contrast of *không/chẳng* equivalent to that of *không (có)/không (có) phải*, is well founded. It is to be noted that a judgement of truth is second with respect to a judgement of existence in the sense that the former should be performed through the latter marked by *có*. The distinction of these two types of negation corresponding to *chẳng* and *không* is confirmed by other phenomena.

2.2. Double negation

In rhetorical questions, double negation is realized with *chẳng*, not with *không*. (6) is well-formed while (7) is not because in the last sentence, *chẳng* is replaced by *không* :

- (6) Nó **chẳng** không quen với mày hay sao ?
 he *chẳng không* know with you or how
 Isn't he one of your acquaintances ?
- (7) *Nó **không** không quen với mày hay sao ?

In (7), replace *không* by *không phải* 'Neg. true', we shall obtain (8), a well-formed sentence semantically equivalent to (6) :

- (8) Nó **không phải** không quen với mày hay sao ?
 it Neg. true Neg. know with you or how
 Isn't it true that he is one of your acquaintances ?

The comparison of (6) with (8) confirms once more the equivalence between *chẳng* and *không phải*.

2.3. Interro-negative

Interro-negative is possible with the negation of truth *chẳng*, or its equivalent *không (có) phải*, not with the negation of existence *không*. Compare (9) to (10) and (11) :

- (9) Mày **không** uống rượu (hay) **chẳng** ?
 you Neg. drink wine or *chẳng*
 Don't you drink wine ?
- (10) *Mày **không** uống rượu (hay) **không** ?
 you Neg. drink wine or *không*
- (11) (Có) **phải** mày **không** uống rượu (hay) **không** ?
 exist true you Neg. drink wine or *không*
 Is it true that you don't drink wine ?

In (11), the final particle *không* is to be read as *không (có) phải* — a negation of truth — by referring to the affirmative term of the question; in (10), the same *không* is to be interpreted as *không có* — a negation of existence. Once more, the semantic equivalence between *chẳng* and *không (có) phải* is clearly established, actually because (9) and (11) are synonymous.

2.4. Không, chẳng and prohibitive negation

To express negative imperatives, Vietnamese uses the auxiliaries *đừng* or *chớ* :

- (12) **Đừng đi / chớ đi**
 Don't go

In modern Vietnamese, *đừng/chớ* can be replaced by *không*, not by *chẳng* :

- (13) *Không đi*
Don't go
- (13') **Chẳng đi*
Don't go

The possible substitution of *đừng/chớ* by *không* — and the impossible use of *chẳng* as a negative imperative — means that the prohibitive is a kind of negation of existence, not a negation of truth. On the one hand, *chẳng* serves to negate the truth of an object whose existence is suspended if not assumed to be well established. On the other hand, *không* 'empty' signifies the void of an object; this explains the potentiality of *không* to mark a prohibitive negative which consists of maintaining an object in the void and therefore to interdict it to come into existence.

3. Negation and quantification

Until now, we have discussed *không* in its uses as a negative particle, especially as a preverbal auxiliary. But *không* can also function as a nominal determiner. As such, *không* is considered to be a zero quantifier :

- (14) *kẻ không nhà*
person zero house
homeless person

Moreover, the Vietnamese equivalent for number zero is *số không* 'number, empty'. In (14), we can naturally add *có* 'to exist, to have', but then instead of a lexical compound unit, we will have a noun phrase or a sentence, ex. (15), whose main verb is *có* 'to have':

- (15) *kẻ không có nhà*
person Neg. have house
the person who is homeless

In (15) where the main verb is *có* 'to have', *không* and *chẳng* are interchangeable but in (14) only *không* is acceptable. That means that *không* as semantically equivalent to *không có* 'Neg. exist' can be used as a nominal quantifier while *chẳng* having no such reading cannot function as a quantifier. Therefore, it is not surprising that the expression *số chẳng* 'number zero' is not acceptable in Vietnamese. This contrast between *không* and *chẳng* confirms once more our analysis that *không* and *chẳng* are two different types of negation, one bringing upon the quantity (the existence), the other upon the quality (the truth).

4. A tentative conclusion

The grammaticalization of *không* 空 'empty, void' of Chinese origin into a negative particle in Vietnamese began in the 17th century and coincided with the numerous arrivals in Vietnam of Western businessmen. *Không* took over *chẳng* as a negative particle at the beginning of the 20th century, at the same time as France established her rule in this country. These two facts suggest one thing : Vietnamese had finally invented the number zero *số không* which is crucial to business. Indeed, before *số không* no other term is found to render "zero". But what deserves to be noted here is the relation between the quantifier zero and the verbal particle *không* which has developed into another type of negation from that of *chẳng*.

It will be noted also that prohibitives are marked as a negation of existence and that in a double negation, one should be a modal negation, bringing upon a judgement of quality (true or not) and not upon a consideration of quantity (exist or not). It will be interesting to see how these data specific to Vietnamese work in other languages.

5. Negation in some of the Việt-Mường languages

With regard to negation, it will be noteworthy to have a look at some of the Việt-Mường languages. In *Mường*, a language very close to Vietnamese, *chẳng* is still the main negation particle. But in *Nguồn*, another Việt-Mường dialect, *không* is the attested negation auxiliary. Some of the small Việt-Mường dialects, such as *Arem* (population: 80), *Rục* (population: 200) use neither *chẳng* nor *không* as a negative particle but *vắng* which means "absence".

Many authors (H. Maspero, 1912; J. Cuisinier, 1951) consider *Nguồn*, *Arem* and *Rục* as different *Mường* dialects, implying that the *Nguồn* people living in Quảng Bình province are of *Mường* origin. Other authors, mostly Vietnamese (Nguyễn Dương Bình, 1975; Nguyễn Khắc Tụng, 1975) use family registers and housing characteristics to prove that *Nguồn* were Vietnamese, natives of the neighboring northern provinces of Thanh Hoá, Nghệ An and Hà Tĩnh. These people to avoid war and troubles, emigrated to the present mountainous area of Quảng Bình around the 17th century. In this discussion on the origin of the *Nguồn* people, do the remarks on negation help to give an adequate answer ?

Bibliography

BENVENISTE, Emile. 1974. *Problèmes de linguistique générale II*. Paris : Gallimard.

CADIERE, Léopold. 1905. Les hautes vallées du Sông-Gianh, *BFEQ* V. 349-367.

CUSINIER, Jeanne. 1948. *Les Mường. Géographie humaine et sociologie*. Paris : Institut d'Ethnologie.

De RHODES, Alexandro. 1651. *Dictionarium annamiticum lusitanum et latinum*. Rome : Sacrae Congregationis.

FERLUS, Michel, NGUYỄN Phú Phong. 1977. Analyse de quatre articles d'ethno-linguistique publiés à Hanoi. *Cahiers d'Etudes Vietnamiennes*, 3, 3-15. Université Paris 7.

HÀ Quang Năng, PHẠM Ngọc Tĩnh. 1976. Vài nhận xét về sự phân bố từ loại trong ngôn ngữ báo chí-chính luận Việt Nam [Some remarks on the distribution of parts of speech in the Vietnamese press vocabulary]. *Ngôn Ngữ* [Language], Hanoi, n° 4, 34-49.

NGUYỄN Dương Bình. 1975. Về thành phần dân tộc của người Nguồn [On the ethnic membership of the Nguồn people]. In Viện Dân Tộc Học [Institute of Ethnology], *Về vấn đề xác định thành phần các dân tộc thiểu số ở miền Bắc Việt Nam* [On the problem of determining ethnic membership of minority groups in northern Vietnam]. Hà Nội : Nxb KHXH.

NGUYỄN Khắc Tụng. 1975. Góp phần tìm hiểu thành phần tộc người của người Nguồn qua những nhận xét về nhà ở của họ [A contribution to the study of the ethnic membership of the Nguồn people through their housing characteristics]. In Viện Dân Tộc Học, *Về vấn đề xác định thành phần các dân tộc thiểu số ở miền Bắc Việt Nam* [On the problem of determining ethnic membership of minority groups in northern Vietnam]. Hà Nội: Nxb KHXH.

NGUYỄN Phú Phong, TRẦN Trí Dõi, M. FERLUS. 1988. *Lexique Vietnamien-Ruc-Français*. Paris : Université de Paris VII.

NGUYỄN Phú Phong. 1992. *Questions de linguistique vietnamienne. Les classificateurs et les déictiques*. Université Paris 7 : Thèse d'Etat.

THOMPSON, Laurence C. 1965. *A Vietnamese grammar*. Seattle: University of Washington Press.

THOMPSON, Laurence C. 1976. Proto-Viet-Muong Phonology. In P.N. Jenner, L.C. Thompson, and S. Starosta, eds., *Austroasiatic Studies*, Part II. The Univ. of Hawai Press.